UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,835	08/04/2003	Tedd E. Elich	9280.2	5061

20792 7590 12/12/2005

MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC
PO BOX 37428
RALEIGH, NC 27627

EXAMINER	
BASKAR, PADMAVATHI	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1645	

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/633,835	ELICH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Padmavathi v. Baskar	1645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) 1-22 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

RESTRICTION

1. Restriction to one of the following groups of invention is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-13 drawn to a peptide, composition classified in class 530 subclass 350,

(Further restriction to one SEQ.ID.NO required (see paragraph # 3).

II. Claims 14-15, drawn to DNA, host cell classified in class 536, subclass 23.7. (Further restriction to one SEQ.ID.NO required, see paragraph # 3).

III. Claims 16-17 drawn to a method for identifying Acetyl CoA carboxylase inhibitors using polypeptide classified in class 435, subclass 7 .1

(Further restriction to one SEQ.ID.NO required, see paragraph # 3).

IV. Claims 18 drawn to a method for identifying fungicides using polypeptide classified in class 435, subclass 4.

(Further restriction to one SEQ.ID.NO required, see paragraph # 3).

V. Claims 19-20 drawn to a kit comprising first and second peptides, said first and second peptides are from different species i.e., non- mammalian and mammalian classified in class 435, subclass 810.

(Further restriction to one SEQ.ID.NO required, see paragraph # 4).

VI. Claims 21-22 drawn to a kit comprising first and second peptides, said peptides are from same species, i.e., *S.cerivasae* classified in class 435, subclass 810/ 940.

(Further restriction to one SEQ.ID.NO required, see paragraph # 4).

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Group I is directed to peptide, which is made of amino acids. Groups II is directed to DNA, which consists of nucleic acids. Invention V is drawn to a kit comprising first and second peptides that are structurally different and distinct, obtained from two different species. The

invention V is distinct from Invention I since the kit contains two structurally different peptides from two different species that are structurally different to each other. The invention of VI is another Patentably different and distinct kit comprising first and second peptides that are obtained from *S.cerivasae, which* is structurally different and distinct product from invention I and V. These products are different to each other structurally, biochemically and functionally and are drawn to patentably distinct molecules which have materially different physical and chemical properties and structures.

Groups III and IV are different methods utilizing different products with different structure and biological properties. Inventions III is a method for identifying Acetyl CoA carboxylase inhibitors where as method IV is specifically identifying fungicides, utilizing different biological reagents different method steps, which result in different outcome.

Distinct Inventions

3. For each group of inventions I-VI above, restriction to one of the following SEQ.ID.NO is also required under 35 USC 121. Therefore, election is required of one of inventions I – VI and one of SEQ ID NO: 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17-21.

Inventions SEQ ID NO: 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17-21 are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions; represent structurally different polypeptides and the polynucleotide encoding them from various species, mammals, insect, yeast, Ascomycota etc. Therefore, where structural identity is required, such as for hybridization or expression, the different sequences have different effects. Thus, each sequence is unique and patentably distinct since each sequence has a different structure with specific amino acid or nucleic acid and is identified by a specific SEQ.ID.NO. Restriction is deemed proper because these

products appear to constitute patentably distinct inventions. These sequences are thus deemed to constitute independent and distinct inventions within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 121. Absent evidence to the contrary, each such sequence is presumed to represent an independent and distinct invention, subject to restriction requirement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 121 and 37 CFR 1.141.

If applicant elects invention from group 1, II, III or IV, Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed SEQ.ID.NO.

If applicant elects group V or VI drawn to kit, then applicant is advised to clearly identify first and second peptides.

4. Invention I is related to inventions III and IV as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polypeptide of Group I can be used in immunoaffinity chromatography methods for purifying antibodies and need not be used in the inventions III and IV.

5. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

6. Concerning the burden of search, classification of subject matter is merely one indication of the burdensome nature of the search involved. The DNA database searches required by each of the sequences and the literature searches for each of the sequences, both of which are

particularly relevant in this art, are not co-extensive and are much more important in evaluating the burden of search. Further, it is doubted that applicants would readily accept the rejection of one sequence by the application of art teaching another sequence. Clearly different searches and issues are involved in the examination of each group.

7. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, the literature and sequence searches required for each of the Groups are not required for another of the Groups, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

8. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP 821 .04.

Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1 .1 16. amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1 .312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 1 12. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In

re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C.121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP 804.01.

9. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

10. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

11. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600, AU 1645 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be transmitted via the PTO Fax Center, which receives transmissions 24 hours a day and 7 days a week. The transmission of such papers by facsimile must conform to the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30, November 15, 1989. The Right Fax number is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PMR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PMR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PMR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).
Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Padma Baskar Ph.D., whose telephone number is ((571) 272-0853. A message may be left on the Examiner's voice mail system. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 6.30 a.m. to 4.00 p.m. except First Friday of each bi-week.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette Smith can be reached on (571) 272-0864. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Padma Baskar Ph.D.

LYNETTE R. F. SMITH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER